



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/068,254

02/04/2002

Alan M. Vale

6783P022

8491

8791

7590

01/02/2008

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

1279 OAKMEAD PARKWAY

SUNNYVALE, CA 94085-4040

EXAMINER

JERABEK, KELLY L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2622

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

01/02/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/068,254

Applicant(s)

VALE ET AL.

Examiner

Kelly L. Jerabek

Art Unit

2622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 October 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 10-16, 18-26, 29 and 30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 10-16, 18-26, 29 and 30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 02 October 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 10/6/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Response to Remarks:

Applicant's arguments regarding claim 29 (Amendment pages 7-8) state that the Bateman reference teaches a wireless connection between a digital camera and a receiver however the Bateman reference does not disclose sending communications wirelessly via a network. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Bateman discloses a connection between the camera base unit (102,104) and the host (108,112) that includes both tethered and wireless connections; where in the wireless case, the base unit (102,104) is capable of wirelessly transmitting to and receiving data from the host (108,112) (page 2, paragraphs 20-21). The Examiner maintains that the wireless connection disclosed by Bateman is a local wireless network capable of wirelessly receiving or transmitting information.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7, 10-16 and 18-26 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bateman et al. US 2002/0194414 in view of Sato et al. US 7,265,779 in view of Yamada et al. US 6,239,837 and further in view of Terakado et al. US 2002/0001042.

Re claim 1, Bateman discloses a method facilitating transfer of information from a data capture device (102) to a host device (108,112) (page 2, paragraphs 21-22). Bateman states that the connection between the camera base unit (102,104) and the host (108,112) includes both tethered and wireless connections; where in the wireless case, the base unit (102,104) is capable of wirelessly transmitting to and receiving data from the host (108,112) (page 2, paragraphs 20-21). Therefore, it can be seen that Bateman teaches a wireless network connection between a data capture device (102,104) and a host device (108,112). Bateman further states that upon connection of

a data capture device (102) to a host device (108,112) that is capable of communicating with the data capture device (102), automatically verifying that a connection has been established between the data capture device (102) and the host device (page 3, paragraph 28) and automatically initiating an immediate transfer of information from the data capture device (102) (pages 2-3 paragraph 23). However, although the Bateman reference discloses all of the above limitations including a wireless communication between a camera and a remote device it fails to specifically disclose a method of facilitating transfer of information from a data capture device to a remote host device, the method comprising: establishing a connection between the data capture device and a pipeline device; establishing a wireless network connection between the data capture device and the remote host device via the pipeline device, wherein the pipeline device enables communication between the data capture device and the remote host device without installation of dedicated software on the pipeline device or the remote host device for enabling said communication.

Sato discloses a method of facilitating transfer of information from a data capture device (10) to a remote host device (42,45,46), the method comprising: establishing a connection between the data capture device (10) and a pipeline device (44); establishing a wireless network connection between the data capture device (10) and the remote host device (42,45,46) via the pipeline device (44), wherein the pipeline device (44) enables communication between the data capture device (10) and the remote host device (42,45,46) without installation of dedicated software on the pipeline device (44) or the remote host device (42,45,46) for enabling communication (col. 4, line

36-col. 5, line 55; figures 1,2). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to have been motivated to include the teaching of enabling a camera to utilize a pipeline device to communicate wirelessly with remote devices as disclosed by Sato in the camera capable of wirelessly communicating with remote devices disclosed by Bateman. Doing so would provide a means for enabling a camera to communicate with remote devices that are located far away from the camera.

Although the combination of the Bateman and Sato references discloses all of the above limitations the combination fails to specifically state that upon connection of the data capture device and to the host device notification that a transfer of information is in process and notification of successful completion of the transfer of information is automatically provided.

Yamada discloses in figures 1-3 a camera capable of accepting an auxiliary memory card (MC). The camera includes a liquid crystal display section (30) that displays a plurality of icon marks (46-66) according to the operation modes of the camera (col. 3, lines 60-67). When the memory card (MC) is attached to the camera, icon mark (64) is displayed thus verifying that the connection has been established and the microprocessor (MPU1) instructs microprocessor (MPU2) to perform processing operations (col. 6, line 53 – col. 7, line 10). When the camera is in the copying mode of copying image data from the main memory (MM) to the memory card (MC), icon mark (62) automatically provides a notification that a transfer of information is in process (col. 4, lines 32-35; col. 9, line 59 – col. 10, line 15). Each time an individual image is transferred and copied the values of icon marks (56, 60) are changed (col. 11, line 59 –

col. 12, line 10). Thus, icon marks (56,60) provide notification of successful completion of the transfer of information. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to have been motivated to automatically provide notification that a transfer of information is in process and automatically provide notification of successful completion of a transfer of information as disclosed by Yamada in the system configured to transfer data between a peripheral device and a host as disclosed by the combination of Bateman and Sato. Doing so would provide a means for allowing a user of an image capture device to view the transfer status of image data being transferred from the image capture device to a host. However, although the combination of the Bateman, Sato and Yamada references discloses all of the above limitations, the combination fails to state that notification of successful completion of a transfer of information is provided by illumination or extinguishing of a light on the data capture device.

Terakado discloses a remote controller (1) that is capable of communicating with multiple electronic devices (3,9,13) (figure 2). Terakado states that CPU (1a) turns on LED (100) to indicate that information is being transferred and the CPU (1a) turns off the LED (100) to indicate the information transfer has finished (page 5, paragraphs 74-84). Thus, it can be seen that it is well known to illuminate or extinguish an LED to notify a user of a device of a transfer state of the device. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to have been motivated to include an LED to indicate the completion of an information transfer as disclosed by Terakado in the camera system disclosed by the combination of Bateman, Sato and Yamada. Doing so would

provide a means for providing an indication that a transfer of information is either in process or has been completed.

Re claims 2 and 3, Terakado states that the notification that the transfer of information is in process is provided by illumination of a light (LED 100) (page 5, paragraph 75).

Re claim 6, when the camera disclosed by Yamada is in the copying mode of copying image data from the main memory (MM) to the memory card (MC), icon mark (62) automatically provides a notification that a transfer of information is in process (col. 4, lines 32-35; col. 9, line 59 – col. 10, line 15). Icon mark (62) is displayed on LCD (30) therefore the icon mark (62) is a notification that a transfer of information is in process that is provided on an LCD (30).

Claims 4-5, 7 and 10-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bateman et al. in view of Sato et al. in view of Yamada in view of Terakado et al. and further in view of Okada US 6,630,954.

Re claim 4, the combination of the Bateman, Sato, Yamada and Terakado references disclose all of the limitations of claims 1 and 2 above. However, although

the Terakado reference discloses an LED (100) for providing a notification of information transfer it fails to state that the LED blinks periodically while the transfer of information is in process.

Okada discloses an image pickup apparatus including an image erasure status notification function. If the image data has already been transferred, a message is provided to the user indicating that the image to be erased has already been transferred to another storing area (col. 2, lines 54-62). The message is provided to the user using either a flickering LED, a display of an LCD, or a sound generation of a buzzer (col. 2, lines 41-53). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to have been motivated to include the concept of using a flickering LED or a buzzer for user notification as disclosed by Okada in the system configured to transfer data between a peripheral device and a host as disclosed by the combination of Bateman, Sato, Yamada and Terakado. Doing so would provide a means for flickering an LED or sounding a buzzer in order to provide notifications to a user of a camera (Okada: col. 2, lines 54-62).

Re claim 5, the combination of the Bateman, Sato, Yamada and Terakado references disclose all of the limitations of claims 1 and 2 above. However, although the Terakado reference discloses an LED (100) for providing a notification of information transfer it fails to state that the LED is green.

Okada discloses an image pickup apparatus including an image erasure status notification function. If the image data has already been transferred, a message is provided to the user indicating that the image to be erased has already been transferred to another storing area (col. 2, lines 54-62). The message is provided to the user using either a flickering LED, a display of an LCD, or a sound generation of a buzzer (col. 2, lines 41-53). Additionally, the LED disclosed by Okada is green to confirm that an image has been transferred (col. 2, lines 41-46). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to have been motivated to include the concept of using an flickering LED or a buzzer for user notification as disclosed by Okada in the system configured to transfer data between a peripheral device and a host as disclosed by the combination of Bateman, Sato, Yamada and Terakado. Doing so would provide a means for flickering an LED or sounding a buzzer in order to provide notifications to a user of a camera (Okada: col. 2, lines 54-62).

Re claim 7, the combination of the Bateman, Sato, Yamada and Terakado references disclose all of the limitations of claims 1 and 2 above. However, although the Terakado reference discloses an LED (100) for providing a notification of information transfer it fails to state that a notification that the transfer of information is in process is provided by an audio signal.

Okada discloses an image pickup apparatus including an image erasure status notification function. If the image data has already been transferred, a message is

provided to the user indicating that the image to be erased has already been transferred to another storing area (col. 2, lines 54-62). The message is provided to the user using either a flickering LED, a display of an LCD, or a sound generation of a buzzer (col. 2, lines 41-53). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to have been motivated to include the concept of using an flickering LED or a buzzer for user notification as disclosed by Okada in the system configured to transfer data between a peripheral device and a host as disclosed by the combination of Bateman, Sato, Yamada and Terakado. Doing so would provide a means for flickering an LED or sounding a buzzer in order to provide notifications to a user of a camera (Okada: col. 2, lines 54-62).

Re claim 10, the combination of Bateman, Sato, Yamada and Terakado discloses all of the limitations of claims 1 above. Yamada also states the when the capacity of the auxiliary memory is insufficient before the whole image is transferred icon mark (60) indicates the number of uncopied image data (col. 12, lines 11-49). However, the combination of Bateman, Sato, Yamada and Terakado does not specifically disclose an automatic notification of failure if the transfer of information is not successfully completed.

Okada discloses an image pickup apparatus including an image erasure status notification function. If the image data has not been transferred, a message is provided to the user indicating that the image to be erased has not been transferred to another

storing area (col. 2, line 63 - col. 3, line 24). The message is provided to the user using either a flickering LED, a display of an LCD, or a sound generation of a buzzer (col. 3, lines 1-10). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to have been motivated to include the concept of using an LED or a buzzer to notify a user that a transfer of information was not successfully completed as disclosed by Okada in the system configured to transfer data between a peripheral device and a host as disclosed by the combination of Bateman, Sato, Yamada and Terakado. Doing so would provide a means for flickering an LED or sounding a buzzer in order to provide notifications to a user of a camera that an image has not yet been transferred (Okada: col. 3, lines 11-19).

Re claims 11-13, Okada states that a red LED is lit to notify the user that the image to be erased is not transferred (col. 3, lines 1-4).

Re claim 14, Okada states that a message on an LCD is used to notify the user that the image to be erased is not transferred (col. 3, lines 4-8).

Claims 15, 18, 21-22 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bateman et al. US 2002/0194414 in view of Sato et al. US 7,265,779 and further in view of Yamada et al. US 6,239,837.

Re claim 15, Bateman discloses a method facilitating transfer of information from a data capture device (102) to a host device (108,112) (page 2, paragraphs 21-22). Bateman states that the connection between the camera base unit (102,104) and the host (108,112) includes both tethered and wireless connections; where in the wireless case, the base unit (102,104) is capable of wirelessly transmitting to and receiving data from the host (108,112) (page 2, paragraphs 20-21). Therefore, it can be seen that Bateman teaches a wireless network connection between a data capture device (102,104) and a host device (108,112). Bateman further states that upon connection of a data capture device (102) to a host device (108,112) that is capable of communicating with the data capture device (102), automatically verifying that a connection has been established between the data capture device (102) and the host device (page 3, paragraph 28) and automatically initiating an immediate transfer of information from the data capture device (102) (pages 2-3 paragraph 23). However, although the Bateman reference discloses all of the above limitations including a wireless communication between a camera and a remote device it fails to specifically disclose a method of facilitating transfer of information from a data capture device to a remote host device, the method comprising: establishing a connection between the data capture device and a pipeline device; establishing a wireless network connection between the data capture device and the remote host device via the pipeline device, wherein the pipeline device enables communication between the data capture device and the remote host device

without installation of dedicated software on the pipeline device or the remote host device for enabling said communication.

Sato discloses a method of facilitating transfer of information from a data capture device (10) to a remote host device (42,45,46), the method comprising: establishing a connection between the data capture device (10) and a pipeline device (44); establishing a wireless network connection between the data capture device (10) and the remote host device (42,45,46) via the pipeline device (44), wherein the pipeline device (44) enables communication between the data capture device (10) and the remote host device (42,45,46) without installation of dedicated software on the pipeline device (44) or the remote host device (42,45,46) for enabling communication (col. 4, line 36-col. 5, line 55; figures 1,2). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to have been motivated to include the teaching of enabling a camera to utilize a pipeline device to communicate wirelessly with remote devices as disclosed by Sato in the camera capable of wirelessly communicating with remote devices disclosed by Bateman. Doing so would provide a means for enabling a camera to communicate with remote devices that are located far away from the camera.

Although the combination of the Bateman and Sato references discloses all of the above limitations it fails to specifically state that upon connection of the data capture device and to the host device notification that a transfer of information is in process and notification of successful completion of the transfer of information is automatically provided.

Yamada discloses in figures 1-3 a camera capable of accepting an auxiliary memory card (MC). The camera includes a liquid crystal display section (30) that displays a plurality of icon marks (46-66) according to the operation modes of the camera (col. 3, lines 60-67). When the memory card (MC) is attached to the camera, icon mark (64) is displayed thus verifying that the connection has been established and the microprocessor (MPU1) instructs microprocessor (MPU2) to perform processing operations (col. 6, line 53 – col. 7, line 10). When the camera is in the copying mode of copying image data from the main memory (MM) to the memory card (MC), icon mark (62) automatically provides a notification that a transfer of information is in process (col. 4, lines 32-35; col. 9, line 59 – col. 10, line 15). Each time an individual image is transferred and copied the values of icon marks (56, 60) are changed (col. 11, line 59 – col. 12, line 10). Therefore, icon marks (56,60) provide notification of successful completion of the transfer of information. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to have been motivated to automatically provide notification that a transfer of information is in process and automatically provide notification of successful completion of a transfer of information as disclosed by Yamada in the system configured to transfer data between a peripheral device and a host as disclosed by the combination of Bateman and Sato. Doing so would provide a means for allowing a user of an image capture device to view the transfer status of image data being transferred from the image capture device to a host.

Re claim 18, when the memory card (MC) is attached to the camera, icon mark (64) is displayed on LCD (30) thus verifying that the connection has been established and the microprocessor (MPU1) instructs microprocessor (MPU2) to perform processing operations (col. 6, line 53 – col. 7, line 10).

Re claim 21, when the camera is in the copying mode of copying image data from the main memory (MM) to the memory card (MC), icon mark (62) automatically provides a notification on LCD (30) that a transfer of information is in process (col. 4, lines 32-35; col. 9, line 59 – col. 10, line 15).

Re claims 22 and 25, each time an individual image is transferred and copied the values of icon marks (56, 60) on LCD (30) are changed (col. 11, line 59 – col. 12, line 10). Therefore, icon marks (56,60) provide notification of successful completion of the transfer of information.

Claims 16, 19-20, 23-24 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bateman et al. in view of Sato et al. in view of Yamada and further in view of Okada US 6,630,954.

Re claim 16, the combination of the Bateman, Sato and Yamada references discloses all of the limitations of claim 15 above. However, the notifications provided by

Yamada are icon marks that are displayed on an LCD. The combination of Bateman, Sato and Yamada does not specifically state that the notifications are light emitting diodes or audio signals.

Okada discloses an image pickup apparatus including an image erasure status notification function. If the image data has already been transferred, a message is provided to the user indicating that the image to be erased has already been transferred to another storing area (col. 2, lines 54-62). The message is provided to the user using either a flickering LED, a display of an LCD, or a sound generation of a buzzer (col. 2, lines 41-53). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to have been motivated to include the concept of using an LED or a buzzer for user notification as disclosed by Okada in the system configured to transfer data between a peripheral device and a host as disclosed by the combination of Bateman, Sato and Yamada. Doing so would provide a means for flickering an LED or sounding a buzzer in order to provide notifications to a user of a camera (Okada: col. 2, lines 54-62).

Re claims 19-20 and 23, the combination of the Bateman, Sato and Yamada references discloses all of the limitations of claim 15 above. However, the notifications provided by Yamada are icon marks that are displayed on an LCD. The combination of Bateman, Sato and Yamada does not specifically state that the notification consists of a blinking light emitting diode.

Okada discloses an image pickup apparatus including an image erasure status notification function. If the image data has already been transferred, a message is provided to the user indicating that the image to be erased has already been transferred to another storing area (col. 2, lines 54-62). The message is provided to the user using either a flickering LED, a display of an LCD, or a sound generation of a buzzer (col. 2, lines 41-53). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to have been motivated to include the concept of using an LED or a buzzer for user notification as disclosed by Okada in the system configured to transfer data between a peripheral device and a host as disclosed by the combination of Bateman, Sato and Yamada. Doing so would provide a means for flickering an LED or sounding a buzzer in order to provide notifications to a user of a camera (Okada: col. 2, lines 54-62).

Re claim 24, the combination of the Bateman, Sato, Yamada and Okada references discloses all of the limitations of claim 23 above. Yamada uses icon marks (56,60) to provide notification of successful completion of transfer of information but does not specifically state that the notification is provided by extinguishing a light on the data capture device. The Examiner takes **Official Notice** that it is well known in the art to illuminate an LED on a device that is transferring data during the transfer of the data and to turn off the LED when the transfer is completed. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to have been motivated to provide an LED that is turned off when the transfer of data is completed in place of the icon marks (56,60) for providing visual notification of successful completion of transfer of information.

Re claim 26, the combination of the Bateman, Sato and Yamada references disclose all of the limitations of claims 15 above. Yamada also states the when the capacity of the auxiliary memory is insufficient before the whole image is transferred icon mark (60) indicates the number of uncopied image data (col. 12, lines 11-49). However, the combination of the Bateman, Sato and Yamada references does not specifically disclose an automatic notification of failure if the transfer of information is not successfully completed.

Okada discloses an image pickup apparatus including an image erasure status notification function. If the image data has not been transferred, a message is provided to the user indicating that the image to be erased has not been transferred to another storing area (col. 2, line 63 - col. 3, line 24). The message is provided to the user using either a flickering LED, a display of an LCD, or a sound generation of a buzzer (col. 3, lines 1-10). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to have been motivated to include the concept of using an LED or a buzzer to notify a user that a transfer of information was not successfully completed as disclosed by Okada in the system configured to transfer data between a peripheral device and a host as disclosed by the combination of Bateman, Sato and Yamada. Doing so would provide a means for flickering an LED or sounding a buzzer in order to provide notifications to a user of a camera that an image has not yet been transferred (Okada: col. 3, lines 11-19).

Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bateman et al. US 2002/0194414 in view of Yamada et al. US 6,239,837 and further in view of Terakado et al. US 2002/0001042.

Re claim 29, Bateman discloses a method facilitating transfer of information from a data capture device (102) to a host device (108,112) (page 2, paragraphs 21-22). Bateman states that the connection between the camera base unit (102,104) and the host (108,112) includes both tethered and wireless connections; where in the wireless case, the base unit (102,104) is capable of wirelessly transmitting to and receiving data from the host (108,112) (page 2, paragraphs 20-21). Therefore, it can be seen that Bateman teaches a wireless network connection between a data capture device (102,104) and a host device (108,112). Bateman further states that upon connection of a data capture device (102) to a host device (108,112) that is capable of communicating with the data capture device (102), automatically verifying that a connection has been established between the data capture device (102) and the host device (page 3, paragraph 28) and automatically initiating an immediate transfer of information from the data capture device (102) (pages 2-3 paragraph 23). However, although the Bateman reference discloses all of the above limitations it fails to specifically state that upon connection of the data capture device and to the host device notification that a transfer of information is in process and notification of successful completion of the transfer of information is automatically provided.

Yamada discloses in figures 1-3 a camera capable of accepting an auxiliary memory card (MC). The camera includes a liquid crystal display section (30) that displays a plurality of icon marks (46-66) according to the operation modes of the camera (col. 3, lines 60-67). When the memory card (MC) is attached to the camera, icon mark (64) is displayed thus verifying that the connection has been established and the microprocessor (MPU1) instructs microprocessor (MPU2) to perform processing operations (col. 6, line 53 – col. 7, line 10). When the camera is in the copying mode of copying image data from the main memory (MM) to the memory card (MC), icon mark (62) automatically provides a notification that a transfer of information is in process (col. 4, lines 32-35; col. 9, line 59 – col. 10, line 15). Each time an individual image is transferred and copied the values of icon marks (56, 60) are changed (col. 11, line 59 – col. 12, line 10). Thus, icon marks (56,60) provide notification of successful completion of the transfer of information. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to have been motivated to automatically provide notification that a transfer of information is in process and automatically provide notification of successful completion of a transfer of information as disclosed by Yamada in the system configured to transfer data between a peripheral device and a host as disclosed by Bateman. Doing so would provide a means for allowing a user of an image capture device to view the transfer status of image data being transferred from the image capture device to a host. However, although the combination of the Bateman and Yamada references discloses all of the above limitations, the combination fails to state that notification of successful

completion of a transfer of information is provided by illumination or extinguishing of a light on the data capture device.

Terakado discloses a remote controller (1) that is capable of communicating with multiple electronic devices (3,9,13) (figure 2). Terakado states that CPU (1a) turns on LED (100) to indicate that information is being transferred and the CPU (1a) turns off the LED (100) to indicate the information transfer has finished (page 5, paragraphs 74-84). Thus, it can be seen that it is well known to illuminate or extinguish an LED to notify a user of a device of a transfer state of the device. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to have been motivated to include an LED to indicate the completion of an information transfer as disclosed by Terakado in the camera system disclosed by the combination of Bateman and Yamada. Doing so would provide a means for providing an indication that a transfer of information is either in process or has been completed.

Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bateman et al. US 2002/0194414 in view of Yamada et al. US 6,239,837 in view of Terakado et al. US 2002/0001042 and further in view of Jackel et al. US 2003/0133015.

Re claim 30, the combination of the Bateman, Yamada and Terakado references discloses all of the limitations of claim 29 above. However, although the combination of

the references discloses a camera capable of wirelessly communicating with remote devices none of the references state that the wireless network connection is a wireless internet connection.

Jackel discloses a web-connected interactive digital camera. The camera (10) disclosed by Jackel is capable of communicating with remote devices via a wireless internet connection (page 2, paragraph 19). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to have been motivated to include the teaching of enabling a camera to communicate wirelessly with remote devices via a wireless internet connection as disclosed by Jackel in the camera capable of wirelessly communicating with remote devices disclosed by the combination of Bateman, Yamada and Terakado. Doing so would provide a means for enabling a camera to communicate with remote devices that are located far away from the camera.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contacts

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kelly L. Jerabek whose telephone number is **(571) 272-7312**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (8:00 AM - 5:00 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lin Ye can be reached on **(571) 272-7372**. The fax phone number for submitting all Official communications is **(571) 273-7300**. The fax phone number for submitting informal communications such as drafts, proposed amendments, etc., may be faxed directly to the Examiner at **(571) 273-7312**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should

Application/Control Number:
10/068,254
Art Unit: 2622

Page 24

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic
Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KLJ

Kelly L. Gervais



LIN YE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER